

## **Remarks**

Reconsideration is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### **I. Status of claims**

Claims 1-180 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 181-198 are added and are pending.

### **II. Telephone interview**

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the telephone interview conducted on November 5, 2003 with the undersigned. During the interview, the objections to the drawings and specification, and the rejection for new matter, were discussed. In addition, the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, and the prior art rejections and the Cox reference (US 3,120,842) were discussed. No agreement was reached concerning the allowability of any of the claims.

### **III. Claim amendments**

Rejected claims 127-180 have been canceled, and replaced with new claims 181-198. The number of claims has been reduced in order to expedite examination. Further, many of the examined claims have been retained, but have been canceled and renumbered starting from claim 181 to help facilitate examination of the claims by the Examiner. In particular:

I) Claims 127-141, 169, 172, 175, and 178 have been canceled at this time.

Applicants do not concede the propriety of the rejections to these claims, and reserve the right to file identical claims in a later filed application.

II) Claims 142-144, 173, 176, 179 have been canceled and replaced with new claims 181-190, where:

- a) i) New claim 181 is similar to claim 142. However, one way that claim 181 differs from claim 142 is that claim 181 has been written to more clearly define the extent of the engagement surface and to more clearly recite how the acute angle is defined. The amended language is supported

by the original specification, for example page 7, line 28 and page 8, line 1. Further, claim 181 recites at least one first engagement surface.

ii) Claim 181 has also been written in sub-paragraph form to improve the form of the claim. Other changes have been made to improve the form of the claim. These changes concern form only and no new matter has been entered.

- b) New claim 182 recites first engagement surfaces extending outwardly from the first splitting edge on each side thereof.
- c) New claim 183 is similar to claim 143. However, one way that claim 183 differs from claim 143 is that claim 183 has been written to more clearly define the extent of the engagement surfaces and to more clearly recite how the acute angle is defined. The amended language is supported by the original specification, for example page 7, line 28 and page 8, line 1.
- d) New claim 184 is similar to claim 144. However, one way that claim 184 differs from claim 144 is that the word "preferably" is no longer used. This change involves removal of a word, and no new matter has been entered.
- e) New claim 185 is similar to claim 173. However, one way that claim 185 differs from claim 173 is that the word "splitter" has been replaced with "first splitting blade".  
This change was necessary to provide consistency with the language used in claim 181, which recites "first splitting blade assembly" rather than a "splitter".
- f) New claim 186 is similar to claim 176. However, one way that claim 186 differs from claim 176 is that the word "splitter" has been replaced with "splitting blade".  
This change was necessary to provide consistency with the language used in claim 181, which recites "splitting blade assembly" rather than a "splitter".
- g) New claim 187 is similar to claim 179.

- h) New claims 188-190 are similar to previous claims 162-163 and 167, respectively.

III. Claims 145-159, 170, 174, 177 and 180 have been canceled at this time.

Applicants do not concede the propriety of the rejections to these claims, and reserve the right to file identical claims in a later filed application.

IV. Claims 160-168 and 171 have been canceled and replaced with new claims 191-19, where:

- a) New claim 191 is similar to claim 160. However, the splitting blade and the projections have been further defined and the claim has been written in sub-paragraph form. The language in claim 191 is supported by the original disclosure, for example the original figures.
- b) New claim 192 is similar to claim 161.
- c) New claim 193 is similar to claim 162.
- d) New claim 194 is similar to claim 163.
- e) New claim 195 is similar to claim 164.
- f) New claim 196 is similar to claim 166.
- g) New claim 197 is similar to claim 167.
- h) New claim 198 is similar to claim 168.

V. In new claims 181-198, the word "concrete" is now used in place of the word "masonry". This change is supported by the original specification, for example page 1, lines 19-25 and page 18, line 5.

This change was made to clarify that the invention is not limited to a block splitter or splitting blade assembly that produces blocks that are laid up using mortar between the blocks, as may be implied by the word "masonry". As described on page 2, lines 9-13 of the specification, the invention also applies to retaining wall blocks, including those having integral locating flanges, such as the flange that is shown on the bottom surface of the block in Figures 6 and 7. Retaining wall blocks, including those with integral locator flanges, are simply dry stacked in ascending courses and do not require the use of mortar to secure the blocks together. While the National Concrete Masonry Association calls retaining wall blocks "concrete masonry units" on

its website, other websites use "masonry" blocks only to denote blocks that are laid up using mortar.

#### **IV. Drawings**

The previous proposed drawing correction was objected to for introducing new matter, in particular:

- a) the showing of a splitting line; and
- b) Figures 8 and 9 having holders and that the surfaces of the holders slope.

With respect to a), the splitting line is no longer in the proposed drawing correction.

With respect to b), the "holder" feature is no longer in the proposed drawing correction.

Applicants traverse the assertions that illustration of the splitting line and that the blades in Figures 8 and 9 have holders are new matter, but have chosen not to pursue these issues further at this time in the interest of expediting prosecution. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

#### **V. Specification**

The substitute specification filed on May 20, 2003 is objected to for introducing new matter. In particular, the following are said to be new matter:

- a) references to the splitting line;
- b) new description for Figures 8 and 9, namely the reference to holders for the blades.

With reference to a), the enclosed substitute specification does not contain any references to the splitting line.

With reference to b), the enclosed substitute specification does not contain any references to holders for the blades in Figures 8 and 9.

A marked-up copy of the specification showing all changes being made to the substitute specification is enclosed. The changes have been made to the original specification, as previous substitute specifications have not entered.

## **VI. Rejections under 35 USC 112, first paragraph**

Claims 127-180 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as claiming subject matter not supported by the original disclosure.

a) The addition of "splitting line" is asserted to be new matter. The splitting line language is no longer used in any pending claims, or in the specification.

b) The blade holder being disposed at an acute angle is asserted to be new matter. There are no pending claims that recite a blade holder being disposed at an acute angle.

c) The language "workpiece-engaging edge" and "workpiece-engaging tips", is asserted to be new matter. This language is no longer used in any pending claims.

d) The language reciting that the engagement surfaces engage the workpiece to break away portions of the workpiece, is asserted to be new matter. This language is no longer used in any pending claims.

Applicants traverse each of the assertions of the Examiner in items a) through d), but have chosen not to pursue these issues further at this time in the interest of expediting prosecution.

e) The projections engaging the workpiece to break away portions is asserted to be new matter. The function of the projections as breaking away portions of the workpiece is supported by the original disclosure.

i) First, page 8, lines 24-26 of the specification recite the "breaks away" language.

ii) The abstract indicates that the projections supplement or replace the action of the splitting blade in dressing concrete block.

iii) Page 5, lines 21-23 of the specification recite that the pattern of the projections can be changed to impact the "effect to be created in the split block".

iv) Page 6, lines 4-10 of the specification suggest that the height of the projections can impact the affect that is created in the block.

Therefore, the function of the projections as breaking away portions of the workpiece is supported by the original disclosure.

**VII. Rejections under 35 USC 112, first paragraph**

Claims 142-144 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

As indicated above, new claim 181 recites that the engagement surfaces extend outwardly from the first splitting edge at acute angles relative to horizontal.

The language "outwardly" is explicitly recited at page 7, line 28, while "relative to horizontal" is recited at page 8, line 1.

The claim language is definite and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

**VIII. Rejections under 35 USC 102(b) and 35 USC 103(a)**

Claims 127-131, 133-135, 138-141, 145-150, 152, 154-162, 164, 166-168, 172, 174-175, and 177 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Cox et al. (US 3,120,842; hereinafter "Cox").

In addition, claims 132, 151 and 163 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox.

The rejected claims have been canceled. Applicants disagree with the rejections to the canceled claims, but have chosen not to pursue these issues further at this time in the interest of expediting prosecution. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims of identical scope to those canceled in a later filed application. However, Applicants will discuss the Cox reference with respect to new claims 181-198.

Claim 181 resembles previous independent claim 142. As claim 142 was not rejected in view of Cox, claim 181, and claims 182-190 depending therefrom, remain patentable over Cox.

Claim 191 recites a splitting blade assembly that includes, among other features, a splitting blade that includes a splitting edge, and a plurality of projections positioned adjacent to the splitting edge on at least one side thereof. The projections are spaced from the splitting edge and from each other, and the projections are positioned to engage the workpiece and break away portions of the workpiece during operation of the splitting blade to split the workpiece. At least these features are not disclosed in Cox.

Cox discloses upper and lower splitting assemblies 16, 18, each of which includes a plurality of side-by-side cutting elements 80 arranged to form a single knife edge of each splitting assembly 16, 18 (column 3, line 73 to column 4, line 3). The cutting elements 80 are

individually supported to accommodate surface irregularities in the workpiece to be split (column 2, lines 60-66 and column 3, lines 1-4).

Cox does not disclose a splitting assembly that includes a plurality of projections positioned adjacent to the splitting edge of a splitting blade, and the projections being spaced from the splitting edge and from each other.

The rejection asserts that one of the cutting elements 80 in Cox is a blade and the other cutting elements 80 constitute projections on either side of the blade. However, all of the cutting elements 80 in Cox are part of the splitting blade ("to provide in their entirety a knife edge" Cox, column 4, lines 1-2). They are all positioned to define the line along which the workpiece is to be split and are part of the splitting blade. There are no projections adjacent the splitting edge of the blade on at least one side thereof. In addition, the cutting elements 80 of Cox are not spaced from the splitting edge and from each other. There are no projections positioned to engage the workpiece and break away portions of the workpiece during the operation of the splitting blade to split the workpiece. The cutting elements 80 in Cox simply split the workpiece.

Therefore, independent claim 191 is patentable over Cox.

Claims 192-198 depend from claim 191 and are patentable along with claim 191 and need not be separately distinguished.


## **IX. Conclusion**


With these amendments Applicants believe that the claims now pending in this patent application are in immediate condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested. If any further questions arise, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
612/332-5300



Date: February 11, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James A. Larson  
Reg. No.: 40,443




Annotated Sheet Showing Changes





Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

Annotate Sheet Showing Change






FIG. 9

*Another Sheet Showing*  
*Changes*




FIG. 10

Annotated Sheet Showing Changes





FIG. 11

Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

**BLOCK SPLITTING ASSEMBLY AND METHOD**

This application is a continuation-in-part of application serial  
no. 09/330,879 filed on June 11, 1999 (now U.S. Patent 6,321,740).

5

**Field of the Invention**

The invention relates generally to manufacture of masonry block. More specifically, it relates to equipment and processes for the creation of decorative faces on masonry block. Even more specifically, the invention relates to equipment and processes for producing roughened textures and the appearance of weathered or rock-like edges on masonry block.

**Background of the Invention**

The process of splitting a masonry block to create a rock-like appearance on the exposed face of the block is known. See, for example, Besser, U.S. Patent  
15 No. 1,534,353, which discloses the manual splitting of blocks using a hammer and chisel. Automated equipment to split block is well-known, and generally includes a splitting table comprising a supporting table and one or more hydraulically-actuated splitting blades. These machines are useful for the high-speed processing of blocks. They produce a rock-face finish on the blocks. The edges of the faces are generally  
20 well-defined, i.e., "sharp".

It is sometimes desirable to produce a concrete product that has edges which appear to be weathered. This has been a desired look for concrete pavingstones for sometime. Recently, it has become desirable to create the weathered look on the decorative face of concrete retaining wall blocks. The common process for producing  
25 the weathered look on pavers is to "tumble" the pavers in a rotary drum to knock off their sharp edges. This process can be used with some retaining wall blocks, as well, provided that the blocks do not have any features, such as integral concrete locator

flanges, that would be damaged by the tumbling process. Tumbling is not an option with such blocks. The problem with the tumbling process is that it is costly. The process requires the capital investment in a tumbling apparatus, and the upkeep of that equipment. In addition, the pavers or blocks must be removed from the production line, 5 tumbled, and then reassembled into suitable cubes for transportation. This makes the process labor-intensive.

Another option is to use a hammermill to attack the face of the block with various hammers. This option can slow down production, if it is done "in line", because the process can only move as fast as the hammermill can operate on each block, 10 and the block may need to be manipulated-flipped over and or rotated-to attack all of its edges.

Accordingly, there is a need for equipment and a process that will create the appearance of weathered edges on retaining wall ~~block~~ blocks, in such a manner that it will not slow down the production line, will not add costly equipment to the line, will 15 not be labor-intensive, and will not have high cull rates when processing blocks with integral locator flanges or other similar features.

### **Summary of the Invention**

In accordance with a first aspect of the invention, there is provided a block splitter assembly comprising first and second opposed splitting blade assemblies, 20 each of the first and second splitting blade assemblies comprising respective first and second splitting blades and one or more projections positioned adjacent to each of the first and second blades.

In accordance with a second aspect of the invention, there is provided a block splitter comprising first and second opposed splitting blade assemblies, each of 25 the first and second opposed splitting blade assemblies comprising a plurality of projections.

In accordance with another aspect of the invention, there is provided a masonry block splitter comprising first and second opposed splitting blade assemblies, the first blade assembly comprising a first splitting blade having first and second sides, 30 said first blade assembly comprising a plurality of projections adjacent the first splitting

blade first side and a plurality of projections adjacent the first splitting blade second side, the second blade assembly comprising a second splitting blade having first and second sides, the second blade assembly comprising a plurality of projections adjacent the second splitting blade first side and a plurality of projections adjacent the second splitting blade second side.

In accordance with a further aspect of the invention, there is provided a method of splitting masonry block using a masonry block splitter, comprising first and second opposed splitting blade assemblies, said first blade assembly comprising a first splitting blade having first and second sides, said first blade assembly comprising a plurality of projections adjacent said first splitting blade first side and a plurality of projections adjacent said first splitting blade second side, said second blade assembly comprising a second splitting blade having first and second sides, said second blade assembly comprising a plurality of projections adjacent said second splitting blade first side and a plurality of projections adjacent said second splitting blade second side, said method comprising the step of striking the masonry block with said first and second opposed splitting blade assemblies.

In another aspect of the invention, a gripper assembly is employed to hold the work piece together from the sides during splitting. The gripper assembly could optionally include side knives or projections.

#### **Brief Description of the Drawings**

Figure 1 is a partial perspective view of a block splitting machine using the block splitter blade assembly of the invention.

Figure 2A is a top plan view of one portion of a splitting blade assembly in accordance with the invention.

Figure 2B is a top plan view of one portion of a splitting blade assembly also showing ~~protrusion~~ projections of various ~~diameter~~ diameters positioned in a random manner.

Figure 2C is a top plan view of one portion of a splitting blade assembly in accordance with a further alternative embodiment of the invention comprising ~~protrusions~~ projections which are random connected and unconnected panels.



Figure 3 is a side elevational view of an alternative embodiment of a protrusion projection in accordance with the invention.

Figure 4A is a side elevational view of a further alternative embodiment of a protrusion projection in accordance with the invention.

5                    Figure 4B is a side elevational view of another alternative embodiment of the invention depicting protrusions projections of varying height.

Figure 5 is a perspective view of a split work piece (forming two masonry blocks), which was split using the splitter blade assembly of the invention.

10                   Figure 6 is a top plan view of a masonry block split using the splitter blade assembly of the invention.

Figure 7 is a front elevational view of the masonry block depicted in Figure 6.

Figure 8 is a partial sectional end view of an alternative embodiment of a top splitter blade assembly.

15                   Figure 9 is a partial sectional end view of an alternative embodiment of a bottom splitter blade assembly.

Figure 10 is a top plan view of a portion of the Figure 9 embodiment of a bottom splitter blade assembly shown in relation to a work piece.

20                   Figure 11 is a top plan view of a gripper assembly according to the present invention, and another alternative embodiment of a bottom splitter blade assembly, shown in relation to a work piece.

### **Detailed Description of the Preferred Embodiment**

25                   Attention is now directed to the figures where like parts are identified with like numerals through several views. In Figure 1, a conventional block splitting machine modified in accordance with invention is depicted, in part, showing in particular the block splitter assembly 10. Generally, block splitting machines may be obtained from Lithibar Co., located in Holland, Michigan. In particular, the Lithibar Co. 6386 was used in practicing the invention. The block splitter assembly generally  
30                   has opposed first 12 and second 22 splitting blade assemblies. The first splitting blade

assembly 12 is positioned at the bottom of the block splitter 10 and, as depicted, includes a splitting blade 14 and a number of ~~protrusions~~ projections 16 positioned on either side of and adjacent to the blade.

5 The invention may be used with any variety of blocks molded or formed through any variety of processes including those blocks and processes disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 5,827,015 issued October 27, 1998, U.S. Patent No. 5,017,049 issued May 21, 1991 and U.S. Patent No. 5,709,062 issued January 20, 1998.

10 An upper or second splitting blade assembly 22 may also be seen in Figure 1. The second splitting blade assembly 22 also includes a splitting blade 24 and a plurality of projections 26 located on either side of the blade 24. The second splitting blade assembly may be attached to the machine's top plate 30 through a blade holder 28. The position of the work piece 40, (shown in phantom), within the block splitter may be seen in Figure 1, in the ready-to-split position.

15 As can be seen in Figure 2A, the splitting blade assembly 12 is generally comprised of a number of projections 16 positioned adjacent to blade 14 and on either side of the blade 14. As shown, the projections 16 on the first side of the blade are staggered in relationship to the projections 16' on the second side of the blade. The projections on either side of the blade may also be aligned depending upon the intent of the operator.

20 As can be seen in Figure 2B, the ~~protrusions~~ projections 16 may be used without a splitting blade. The ~~protrusions~~ projections 16 may also be varied in diameter or perimeter, (if not round), and placed randomly on the splitting assembly 12. Any number of ordered or random patterns of ~~protrusions~~ projections 16 may be created using regular or irregular spacing depending on the effect to be created in the split  
25 block.

Figure 2C shows a further alternative embodiment of the invention where plates 16" are attached to either, or both, assemblies 12 and 22. As can be seen, these plates may be configured in random order and left unconnected across the surface of the assembly 12. The invention has been practiced using steel plates about four

inches long welded to the assembly to provide a number of partially connected ~~protrusions~~ projections 16" about two inches high.

As shown in Figures 1, 2A, and 2B, the projections 16 and 16' may have a rounded shape. However, the shape of the projections may also be pyramidal, cubic,  
5 or pointed with one or more points on the top surface of the projection. ~~Here again~~ In Figures 2B and 2C, the relative position of the work piece 40 is again shown in phantom outline.

Generally, the ~~protrusions~~ projections may have a diameter of about 1/2 to 1 and 1/4 inches and may be attached by welding, screwing or other suitable means.  
10 The height of the ~~protrusions~~ projections may be about 1 and 1/4 inches and varied about 3/4 of an inch shorter or taller depending upon the affect to be created in the block at splitting. Attaching the ~~protrusions~~ projections by threading or screwing, see Figures 8, 9 and 11, allows easy adjustment of ~~protrusion~~ projection height.

The relative height of the projection and blade may also be varied  
15 depending upon the effect that is to be created in the block split according to the invention. Specifically, as can be seen in Figure 3, the relative height of the blade 14 may be less than the relative height of the projection 16. Alternatively, as can be seen in ~~Figure 4~~ Figure 4A the relative height of the blade may be greater than the height of the projections 26. Generally For example, we have found with the first splitting blade  
20 assembly 12 that X may range from about 1/8 to about 3/8 of an inch beyond the first blade. With regard to the second splitting blade assembly 22, X' may range from about 1/16 to 1/8 of an inch beyond the height of the plurality of the projections.

~~Protrusions~~ Projections 16 such as those depicted in Fig. 2A have been found useful having a diameter of about 1 and 1/4 inches and, when used with a blade  
25 14, having a height of about 1/8 of an inch above the blade in the first or lower assembly and 1/8 of an inch below the blade in the second or upper assembly. Overall, the height of the ~~protrusion~~ projections may vary up or down about 3/8 of an inch relative to the height of the blade.

In operation, the work piece is generally centered in the block splitter  
30 according to known practices as seen in Figures 1, 2A, 2B and 2 2C. The block splitter

is then activated resulting in the first and second opposing splitting blade assemblies converging on, and striking, the work piece 40. In operation, the first and second splitting blade assemblies may travel anywhere from about 1/4 to one inch into the top and bottom surfaces of the work piece. The work piece 40 is then split resulting in an  
5 uneven patterning on the split edges 46 46a, 46b and 46'46a', 46b' of the resulting blocks, 42 and 44, 44 and 42, as illustrated in Figure 5. As depicted, the work piece 40' is split in two. However, it is possible and within the scope of the invention to split the work piece into more than two pieces.

The distance traveled by the ~~protrusions~~ projections 16 into the work  
10 piece may be varied by adjusting the limit switches on the machine and, in turn, varying the hydraulic pressure with which the splitting assembly acts. Generally, the splitting assemblies act on the block with a pressure ranging from about 600 to 1000 psi, and preferably about 750 to 800 psi.

As will be well understood by one of skill in the art, the splitting  
15 machine may include opposed hydraulically activated side knife assemblies (not shown) which impinge upon the block with the same timing and in the same manner as the opposed top and bottom assemblies. Projections 16 may also be used to supplement or replace the action of the side knives. For example, side knives similar to the upper splitting blade 24 shown in Figure 8 can be employed.

20 Closer examination of block 44 after splitting (see Figures 6 and 7) shows the formation of exaggerated points of erosion in the front, split surface 46 47 of the block 44. With the block 44 depicted, both the first and second blade assemblies 12 and 22 comprised ~~protrusions~~ projections 16 and 26, respectively. As a result, depressions 48 and 50 were formed ~~in~~ at the upper and lower edges 46a, 46b of the  
25 front, split surface 46 47 of the block 44, adjacent at the intersection of the upper 52 and lower 54 respective surface of the block 44.

The magnitude of the indentations, 48 and 50, or points of erosion is far greater than that which is caused by conventional splitting blades and may be varied by varying the prominence of the ~~protrusions~~ projections 16 and 26, (height and size),  
30 relative to the height and thickness of the blade. In one embodiment of the invention,

masonry block may be split with only a row or rows of ~~protrusions~~ projections 16 and 26 without a blade 14 and 24.

Referring to Figures 8 and 9, alternative embodiments of a top splitting blade assembly ~~22~~ 22' and bottom splitting blade assembly ~~12~~ 12', respectively, are shown. It has been found that more massive blades 14', 24' having projections 16, 26 thereon create a more desirable block face appearance. Blades 14', 24' each include a central cutting edge 21 and 31, respectively, and surfaces 19, 29 extending outwardly therefrom. Surfaces 19, 29 are at a blunt angle so as to make the top and bottom edges of the block face more rounded and therefore rock-like. ; The surfaces 19, 29 are preferably at an angle  $\alpha$  between  $0^\circ$  and  $30^\circ$  relative to horizontal, most preferably  $23^\circ$ .

Blades 14', 24' include projections 16, 26 that are adjustable and removable. In this way, the same blade assembly can be used for splitting different block configurations by changing the number, location, spacing and height of the projections. Projections 16, 26 are preferably threaded into corresponding threaded openings 17, 27 for adjustment, although other height adjustment means could be employed. The top surface of projections 16, 26 is jagged, comprising many pyramids in a checkerboard pattern. Projections such as these can be obtained from Fairlane Products Co. It will be understood that a variety of other projection top surface configurations could be employed.

The height of the top surface of projections is preferably a distance X' below the top of cutting edge 21, 31, most preferably 0.040 inch below. As discussed above with respect to other embodiments, the projections may extend further below, or some distance above, the top of the blade, within the principles of the invention. The projections shown are 3/4 inch diameter with a 10 thread/inch pitch, and are 1.50 inches long. Diameters between 0.50 and 1.0 inch are believed preferable. The loose block material from the splitting process entering the threads, in combination with the vertical force of the splitting strikes, are considered sufficient to lock ~~them~~ the projections in place.

The preferred top blade assembly 22 22' is 2.5 inches wide. Projections 26 extend perpendicularly from blade surfaces 29 and therefore strike the working piece at an angle.

The preferred bottom blade assembly 42 12' is 4.0 inches wide.

- 5 Projections 16 extend upwardly from shoulders 23 on opposite sides of blade surfaces 19. This configuration breaks away more material and creates a more rounded rock-like top edge (the work piece is typically inverted) of the split blocks. Blade assembly 42 12' could optionally include projections 16 on blade surfaces 19, as shown in Figure 11.

- 10 In operation, the blade assemblies of Figures 8 and 9 are used together and in the same manner described above with respect to cutting depth and hydraulic pressures. It will be understood that the bottom blade assembly could be used on top, and the top blade assembly could be used on the bottom.

- Referring now to Figure 10, a blade assembly 12' according to Figure 9 is depicted positioned for striking a work piece 40. Work piece 40 comprises portions 15 which will result in small 60, medium 62 and large 64 blocks. A projection 16 is preferably placed at each corner of the three blocks 60, 62, 64 to be created, as shown. In this way, more rounded, rock-like corners are formed in the splitting process. This positioning of projections at the block corners can be used in conjunction with mold configurations that pre-form the slab at the corners so as to better achieve this effect.
- 20 Upper blade assembly 22' of Figure 8 has similarly oriented projections except that they are closer to a centerline of the workpiece, as can be seen from Figure 8.

- Referring now to Figure 11, a gripper assembly 70 is shown in conjunction with a work piece 40 and bottom splitting blade assembly 42 12'. Gripper assembly 70 is employed to assist with splitting certain types of larger block units. It is 25 mounted via mounting head 71 on the existing side-knife cylinders of the splitting machine. Rubber shoes 72 are configured to conform to the corresponding outer surface of work piece 40. Each gripper assembly 70 moves in and out laterally, as indicated by arrows, in order to grip work piece 40 from both sides. In the preferred design, assembly 70 is 3.0 inches high and rubber shoes 72 are 50-100 Durometer

hardness. The pressure applied by the hydraulic cylinders is the same as that for the upper and lower blades.

One benefit of this gripper assembly is improving the formation of rounded edges of a work piece made by a bottom blade. ~~Product~~ Work piece 40 is moved along the manufacturing line by positioning bar 80 in the direction of the arrow shown. During splitting, while the rear portion of work piece 40 is held in place by bar 80, the forward portion is free to move forwardly. Many splitting machines have a splitting action whereby the bottom blade moves to engage the product after the top blade has touched the top of the product. The initial cutting action of the top blade can begin to move the forward portion forwardly before the bottom blade has an opportunity to fully form a rounded edge on the forward block with, for example, projections 16 and/or blade surfaces 19. The bottom blade assembly can also lift the work piece, which is undesirable for a number of reasons. By holding the work piece 40 together during splitting, these problems are prevented.

Gripper assembly 70 can optionally include projections 16, as shown in Figure 11. Projections 16 are preferably positioned slightly inside the top and bottom edges of the work piece (four projections for each gripper assembly 70) so when they strike the side of the work piece 40, more rounded block corners will be formed. The assembly can also include a side knife contained within its central cavity 73, having a blunt blade such as those described hereinabove, for forming rounded, rock-like side edges of the split blocks. It may be necessary to include an appropriate strength spring behind the side knife in order to get the desired action from the gripper and knife.

The above specification, examples and data provide a complete description of the manufacture and use of the composition of the invention. Since many embodiments of the invention can be made without departing from the spirit and scope of the invention, the invention resides in the claims hereinafter appended.

### **Abstract**

A block splitting assembly and method which uses any of a variety of ~~protrusions~~ projections to supplement or replace the action of the splitting blade in  
5 splitting and dressing concrete or masonry block. A gripper assembly holds the block during splitting.